



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,216	09/26/2003	Chao-Kang Li	08688.0330US01	2893
23552	7590	06/15/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			AYRES, TIMOTHY MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/672,216	Applicant(s) LI, CHAO-KANG	
	Examiner Timothy M. Ayres	Art Unit 3637	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12,14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,452,788 to Crowley. Crowley teaches a housing for a computer. A housing panel (50) has a window (254). The window has a panel (270) with studs (272,274) that cover the window opening. A first pair of studs (274) are at opposite edges of the window panel at the top. A second pair of studs (272) are also at opposite edges of the window panel but located at the bottom. The first studs (274) travel in a first rail unit that has a groove (155) as seen in figure 4. In the embodiment in figure 5, it is assumed that this groove is there in order for the panel to function. The second studs (274) travel in a second rail unit that has a groove (255). The grooves are defined by inner and outer ribs formed in the housing panel. The securing device (156,256), as best seen in figure 4 is a larger hole or notch that cuts into both the inner and outer ribs to allow the first stud (274) to rest on it and thereby preventing the panel from falling down.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 5, 8, 9, 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,452,788 to Crowley in view of US Patent 6,497,072 to Fries. Crowley does not expressly disclose the inner rib on the second rail comprising a face to rest the second stud when the panel is closed and the first and second rails comprising an inclined segment. Fries teaches a sliding door panel that covers an opening. The sliding door and studs (34,67) that travel in grooves that have inclined segments with faces located at the top on the inner rib. The interaction of the studs and grooves is best seen in figure 13-15. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer of Crowley by

changing the shape of the grooves to the ones taught by Fries so that the panel has a better fit.

6. Claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,452,788 to Crowley in view of Korean Patent 2002084972 to Yum. Crowley discloses every element as claimed and discussed above except a friction member that included a pair of pinions on the housing wall and a pair of corresponding racks on and adjacent to the opposite sides of the window panel and the friction member being located between the first studs and the second studs. Yum teaches a computer housing with a window panel (30) sliding along a track to cover a window (13) in the housing. Friction member that has a pair of pinions (17) that are mounted on the housing wall of the computer between the top and bottom edge of the window panel. Though not shown in the figure of the abstract, it is inherent that the window panel has racks to receive to receive the pinions. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer of Crowley by adding the friction member as taught by Yum to help support the weight of the window panel.

7. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,452,788 to Crowley in view of US Patent 6,497,072 to Fries as applied to claims 5, 8, 9, 16, 19, and 20 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,169,218 to Chu. Crowley in view of Fries disclose every element as claimed and discussed above except

an urging member having a spring arm that is mounted on the housing wall. Chu teaches a computer housing with a window (121) and a window panel (32). The window panel slide in grooves formed by a framework (31) and the housing panel (1). The window panel has urging members (322) mounted thereto. The urging members push the door into the closed fits as seen in figure 5. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer housing of Crowley in view of Fries by adding the urging member to the window panel as taught by Chu to provide a secure fit thereby protecting against dust and moisture.

8. It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Crowley in view of Fries and Chu by having the urging member extend from the housing wall and contact the window panel, since applicant has not disclosed that having the urging member at this specific location solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the window panel would perform equally well with urging member extending from the window panel and contacting the housing wall since it is functionally equivalent and works equally well. Note: it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working part of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

9. Claims 6, 7, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,452,788 to Crowley in view of US Patent 6,497,072 to Fries as applied to claims 5, 8, 9, 16, 19, and 20 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,132,019 to Kim. Crowley in view of Fries disclose every element as claimed and

Art Unit: 3637

discussed above except an urging member having a spring arm that is mounted on the housing wall and the urging member contacting an inclined face of a protrusion on the window panel when the window panel is moved to the closed position. Kim teaches a computer (100) with a housing (1) and a housing wall (2) that has a window for access to the inner space of the housing (1). A window panel (3) is movably mounted between an open and a closed position on a rail unit (50) that is adjacently below the housing wall (2). An urging member (8) that is a spring arm is mounted on the carriage assembly (5) and abuts against an inclined face of the protrusions (25,26) that projects transversely from the window panel (3). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer of Crowley in view of Fries by adding the urging member and the protrusions as taught by Kim to help close the window panel and to help urge the window panel along the inclined segment of the rail units.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 12, and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Since the amendment to claims 1 and 12 only incorporated subject matter that was presented in the previous claims and the rejection was changed this action has been made non-final.


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy M. Ayres whose telephone number is (571) 272-8299. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TMA  
6/07/06



JANET M. WILKENS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art 3637